MR. E.W. BURTON #F02720 IN PROPER
P.O. BOX [illegible]
CORCORAN CA, 93212

~~EXHIBIT A, ATTACHMENT IN SUPPORT OF GROUND~~ IERRREWR

CONTENTION I-B

~~GROUND~~ - UNLAWFUL SEIZURE OF PERSON, HOME, VEHICLE, AND PROPERTY Protections THE FEDERALLY GUARANTEED U.S. CONST, ~~1ST, 4TH, AND~~ 14TH AMENDMENT DUE PROCESS, EQUAL PROTECTION CLAUSES AND PRINCIPLES AND FREE SPEECH CLAUSE AND EXPRESSION CLAUSES OF THE 1ST U.S. CONST AMENDMENT.

STATEMENT OF FACTS - PETITIONERS SEIZURE OF PERSON BY THE POLICE WAS AN INTRUSIVE, INVASIVE, THRESHOLD SEIZURE, OFFICER HOLMES ON 19MARCH04, WHILE PETITIONER WAS STANDING IN THE THRESHOLD IN A PRIVATE RESIDENTIAL PLACE WHERE HE HAD A REASONABLE EXPECTATION OF PRIVACY WHILE ALLEGEDLY MAKING A PHONE CALL TO 911 OPERATOR OF WHICH CALL WAS DESTROYED, ~~IN BAD FAITH~~ erroneously BY THE POLICE, EVIDENCE PROVING PETITIONERS INNOCENCE, OFFICER HOLMES THEREFORE WITHOUT INFERENCE AND NO EVIDENCE OF PROBABLE CAUSE PULLED A GUN ON PETITIONER AFTER BLOCKING HIM IN WITH HIS POLICE VEHICLE IN PETITIONER'S RESIDENTIAL ONE-WAY DRIVEWAY, SEIZED PETITIONER FROM THE THRESHOLD OF HIS APT. MANAGER'S DOORWAY, #6 AT 425 E. MAIN ST. E.C. CA. PETITIONER WAS APPROX 25 FEET AWAY FROM HIS APARTMENT UNIT #5 AND THE SAME APPROX. DISTANCE FROM HIS VEHICLE PARKED ON THE CURTILAGE OF HIS HOME PARKED IN HIS DESIGNATED UNIT #5 PARKING SPACE. PETITIONER HAD NOT BEEN INFORMED WHY HE WAS BEING ARRESTED, HAD NOT BEEN MIRANDIZED, ~~UNTIL AFTER THE~~ POLICE BROKE THE CHAIN OF CUSTODY AFTER OFFICER KIRK INITIATED CUSTODIAL INTERROGATION BY ASKING PETITIONER A DIRECT INCRIMINATING QUESTION, "WHERES THE ALLEGED GUN?" PETITIONER ALLEGEDLY WAS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF OFFICER HOLMES, DESIGNATED THE ARRESTING OFFICER, IN HANDCUFFS AND WITHOUT CONSENT, POLICE OFFICER HOLMES, BROKE THE CHAIN OF CUSTODY, LEAVING PETITIONER ALLEGEDLY ~~STANDING~~ sitting in ~~IN~~ HIS POLICE VEHICLE ALONE, 3 OFFICERS, ENTERED, SEARCH, AND SEIZED AN INSTRUMENT WRAPPED IN A BLANKET FROM PETITIONERS APARTMENT UNIT #5. HE WAS NEVER IN, HE WAS SEIZED AT HIS MANAGERS UNIT, 25 FEET AWAY.

MR. E.W. BOATON #T-2730 INPRO PER.
P.O. BOX 5246-CSATF/SP-CI-132L
CORCORAN, CA.

STATEMENT OF FACTS-

SEE EXHIBIBIT "D" PAGE 96, RT EXCERPT 0125, LINES 9-17 7 FRUIT OF THE POISONOUS TREE- "THE ESSENCE OF A PROVISION FORBIDDING THE ACQUISITION OF EVIDENCE IN A CERTAIN WAY IS THAT NOT MERELY EVIDENCE SO ACQUIRED SHALL NOT BE USED BEFORE THE COURT, BUT THAT IT SHALL NOT BE USED AT ALL." (SILVER THORNE LUMBER CO. V. UNITED STATES (1920) 251 U.S. 385) NOT ONLY IS IT WELL ESTABLISHED THAT EVIDENCE WHICH IS ILLEGALLY OBTAINED CANNOT BE USED (ANGELO V. U.S. (1925) 269 U.S. 20), BUT MAPP V. OHIO (1961) 367 U.S. 643 AND WONG-SUN V. UNITED STATES (1963) 371 U.S. 471 INSTRUCT US THAT THE "FRUITS" RESULTING FROM EVIDENCE SEIZED OR LEADS RESULTING FROM THE EVIDENCE MUST ALSO BE EXCLUDED. SEE ALSO EXHIBIT D, PAGE 99, RT. EXCERPT 0130, LINES 1-26 SEE ALSO EXHIBIT D, PAGE 100, RT EXCERPT 0131, LINES 1-26 SEE EXHIBIT "D" PAGE 1- RT EXCERPT, 0132, LINES 1-28, SEE ALSO EXHIBIT D, PAGE 2, RT. EXCERPT 0133, LINES 1-24. SEE EXHIBIT, A, PAGE 117, RT EXCERPT 822, LINE 22, 7 THE COURT: THE FRUIT-OF-THE-POISONOUS-TREE ARGUMENT--